IDENTIFYING THE EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING OF THE COMMAND LEVEL OFFICERS IN THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE

EXECUTIVE ANALYSIS OF FIRE SERVICE OPERATIONS IN EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

by

William L. Henry
Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service,
Division of Fire and Rescue Services
Montgomery County, Maryland

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program
April 1999

ABSTRACT

The Incident Command System (ICS) has been and continues to be the primary tool for use by senior fire/rescue officers to ensure effective incident management. Merely being a senior fire/rescue officer, however, does not necessarily ensure that the ICS is understood or used competently. The purpose of this Applied Research Project was to attempt to identify the experience levels, both in functioning at the scene of an incident as a command officer and in working with an Emergency Operations Center (EOC), of the command-level officers in the Montgomery County, Maryland, Fire and Rescue Service (MCFRS). Historical and evaluative research methods were utilized to answer the following questions: 1. What is the experience level in the MCFRS both in total years of service and in years as a command-level officer? 2. How many current command-level officers have functioned as an Incident Commander or other levels in the ICS? 3. How many of these officers have functioned in a command-level position when the EOC was activated? 4. Outside of what is required for the rank they hold, what training do these officers have and when was the last training received? A literature review was conducted at the National Fire Academy's Learning Resource Center. County and MCFRS policies, reports and documents were also reviewed. A survey of the current certified command-level officers was conducted in an attempt to determine their experience and training. Results revealed that, on average, only 1.76 command-level officers were dispatched per incident. Of those responding to the survey, the average years of experience

were 27.3 years with an average of 10 years as a command-level officer. Only one of the respondents had not functioned as an incident commander and only three had not participated as a sector officer. The results also indicated that 57.1% had participated on an incident where the EOC had been activated. In addition, on average, the respondents had not received any related training in 1.6 years. Recommendations that were offered included: Commissioning a work group to develop an evaluation process to determine the competency of command-level officers; developing a curriculum for annual, mandatory training in ICS and EOC operations; drafting a proposal for implementation of the evaluation process and mandatory training; determining costs and budget accordingly; and evaluating, annually, the evaluation process and mandatory training after implementation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Formal management of emergency incidents has been an integral aspect of everyday life for command-level officers in the fire, rescue and EMS services. Since the 1970's and the early days when the Firefighting Resources of Southern California Organized for Potential Emergencies program (FIRESCOPE) and the National Interagency Incident Management System (NIIMS) were developed, emphasis has been placed on command-level officers to manage incidents effectively and not merely to put the wet stuff on the hot stuff. With the number of calls for assistance multiplying each year, and the ever increasing potential for major incidents such as the bombing in Oklahoma or the grain elevator explosion in Sedgwick County, Kansas in 1998, the emphasis on effectively using an incident command or management system is paramount.

The Montgomery County, Maryland, Fire and Rescue Service (MCFRS) has utilized an Incident Command System, which is a compilation of Brunacini's Fire Ground Command and NIIMS, along with an Integrated Emergency Command Structure, since 1990. While there have been revisions to both of these processes or regulations, it appears that no formal study as to the experience level or training experience of those individuals who are command officers has been undertaken. As such, it currently cannot be ascertained that a Deputy Chief, for example, is any better qualified to serve in a command role than a District or Assistant Chief.

Another aspect of managing major incidents is the interaction with an

Emergency Operations Center that may be activated to formalize coordination of resources throughout the government and the community. The Emergency Management Section of MCFRS conducts a minimum of four exercises a year. The mock incident that comprises the exercise dictates what agencies participate. Because Emergency Management is a function of the fire and rescue service, there is always fire and rescue participation. Unfortunately, these exercises are conducted on weekdays during the daytime hours. This effectively eliminates volunteer fire and rescue personnel from participating. It can only be assumed that this lack of participation reduces the effectiveness of the fire and rescue service in incidents where the Emergency Operations Center is activated. Again, there is no clear documentation of what experience the current command-level officers in Montgomery County have in dealing with an Emergency Operations Center.

The purpose of this research project is to attempt to identify the experience levels, both in functioning at the scene of an incident as a command officer and in working with an Emergency Operations Center, of the command level officers in the Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service. Historical and evaluative research methods were utilized to answer the following questions:

What is the experience level in the Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service, both in total years of service and in years as a command-level officer?

How many current command-level officers have functioned as an Incident

Commander or other levels in the Incident Command System?

How many of these officers have functioned in a command-level position when the Emergency Operations Center was activated?

Outside of what is required for the rank they hold, what training do these officers have and when was the last training received?

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Montgomery County is a Maryland jurisdiction in the Washington, D.C. Metropolitan Area, serving a population of over 840,000 in a county that is comprised of urban, suburban and rural areas. The newly revamped (July, 1998) Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service (MCFRS), comprises the components (excluding police agencies) that deliver emergency services in Montgomery County. The MCFRS is a combination system that includes the Fire Rescue Commission (the policy making body for the fire service), the Division of Fire and Rescue Services (the career force), the Division of Volunteer Fire and Rescue Services (day-to-day administrative responsibilities over the local fire and rescue departments) and the 19 local fire and rescue departments (LFRD) that are predominantly volunteer. The MCFRS is headed by a civilian fire administrator who will implement and enforce the Fire and Rescue Commission's policies and procedures.

The MCFRS operates 33 fire and rescue stations in conjunction with the 19 LFRDs utilizing career staff and approximately 840 volunteers. The Division of Fire

and Rescue Services' (DFRS) FY99 complement of career firefighter/rescuers is 874, with the majority of those fire fighters assigned to the Operations Bureau to staff apparatus. Also under the direction of MCFRS are Fire Code Enforcement, Emergency Management, Fire and Explosive Investigations, Fire and Rescue Training Academy, Specialty Teams, Emergency Communications Center and the Fire Administrator's Office.

In the years before January 1988, career fire fighters were employed by the individual fire/rescue corporations. A Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) lawsuit about overtime resulted in the County enacting emergency legislation that transferred all career fire fighter/rescuers to the control and employ of the county government. This became effective on January 16, 1988, and is commonly referred to as "transition".

The current reorganization occurred after a referendum that would have created a "Super Chief", a career fire chief who would have control over the entire service - was defeated by the citizens. After this defeat, but with the knowledge that changes were necessary, the county executive, in December 1996, appointed a task force to develop a plan for the legislation that created the current system. One of the mandates of this legislation was a report on the status of the Integrated Command Structure.

Development of the Incident Command System in Montgomery County began in 1987 and ultimately was passed as a regulation by the Fire and Rescue Commission in 1990. The Fire and Rescue Commission already had established

the Incident Emergency Command Structure (IECS) through regulation. This regulation established an operational chain of command that integrated all fire and rescue personnel, both career and volunteer, into one command structure.

To be certified at a specific rank in the IECS, an individual must meet the minimum training and certification requirements established by the Fire and Rescue Commission. The Fire and Rescue Commission then places that individual on a certified list that is distributed throughout the service. While the Fire and Rescue Commission establishes minimum requirements for each rank, both for training and certifications, the selection of individuals for officers differs among the LFRDs and the DFRS. Promotion to an officer's position in DFRS, in addition to meeting training and experience requirements, which are more stringent than the minimum standards required by the FRC, includes successfully passing a competitive promotional process. In most of the LFRDs, however, at least the Chief and the senior ranks are determined by a vote of the membership. Usually, the line officers are then appointed by the Chief. Of course, these individuals must meet the minimum requirements established by the Fire and Rescue Commission.

Specifics regarding the experience levels and additional training received by the certified command-level officers have never been addressed. This study will attempt to do that. This applied research project will relate to the Incident Command System module, Unit 3, and the Emergency Operations Center module, Unit 9, of Executive Analysis of Fire Service Operations in Emergency Management.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The National Fire Academy's Learning Resource Center (LRC), as well as County laws and sources, and Fire and Rescue Commission policies and documents were used as the literature research for this project. Since this project was specific to Montgomery County very little information specifically addressed the issues being studied.

In the student manual for the National Fire Academy's *Executive Analysis of Fire Service Operations in Emergency Management*, it states "The ICS is probably one of the most important tools available to the executive-level chief officer in dealing with the responsibility of managing emergency incidents" (p. SM 3-4). Podlubny wrote that "The Incident Command System is a management tool provided to mitigate a major emergency through a systematic means of planning, organization and control" (1992, p. 10). Bruno echoed these statements in an article for Firehouse Magazine stating "That's the purpose of incident command. It is a planned system to effectively and safely manage large numbers of emergency units and personnel on the scene of a major incident" (November, 1989, p. 8). The Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Commission's Executive Regulation, *Incident Command System*, has tended to support these statements in the Background section by stating "The Incident Command System assists the Incident Commander by providing a systematic application of resources to assure that standard emergency objectives

are accomplished safely" (p. 1) and in the Purpose section by stating, "to establish a system of incident management ... to assure effective emergency incident control efforts" (p. 2).

Others have written about the importance of utilizing the ICS, and the state of emergency operations without it. In the March, 1997 *Fire Engineering*, Coleman wrote, "Before the ICS, officers, and even chiefs, responded to an incident and often operated with little or no direction from the individual in charge (if there was an individual in charge)" (p. 112). Flannery, wrote in the April, 1996 *Fire Engineering*, "The modern fireground commander uses an incident command system (ICS) to control the use of resources at an emergency. Without such a system, the result usually is chaos" (p. 24).

The ICS, through delegation and proper communication, can prevent an incident from turning into "chaos". Podlubny stated, "The two components of management that are most necessary to make the ICS effective are communication and delegation" (p. 11). In the June, 1989 *Fire Chief*, Meyer wrote, "When broken down into its original intent, ICS, as an incident management system, is a structural information gathering and communicating process" (p. 41). Rubin, wrote about the ICS in the June, 1997 *Firehouse* and stated "One principle that allows the system to be ‘all risk’ is the function of delegation" (p. 30). Montgomery County FRC ICS regulation, again, in the Background section, reflects the positions above by stating "This allows the Incident Commander to delegate tasks and responsibilities so more

time may be spent managing the overall incident" (p. 2).

An important aspect of an ICS has been the establishment of command and, when necessary, the transfer of command. Podlubny found that "No great benefit or opportunity was gained through the execution of transfer of command at a major incident" (p. 18). He further stated "The senior officer should never arbitrarily assume the role of incident commander" (p. 32). This was in summary of his earlier discussions in which he wrote, in discussing why senior officers assume control of an incident, "Primarily because they have the power allocated to them there is the tendency for senior officers to believe that it is their right to take control, whether it is a requirement or not" (p. 3). He also stated "because of the earned seniority and authority bestowed upon them, senior officers/managers believe they are superior in ability and power to junior counterparts in their departments" (p. 3). The Montgomery County FRC ICS regulation has provided for the transfer of command, but does not require it. It stated, "The arrival of a ranking officer at an incident does not mean command has been transferred" (p. 17). It stated further, in support of the above "If Command is effectively handling a tactical situation ... it may be desirable for that officer to continue in an active command role" (p. 17). However, this regulation is very clear, in that it states "The ranking officer on the scene cannot delegate the responsibility for the proper handling or the final outcome of a given incident" (p. 17).

Another FRC Executive Regulation, *Integrated Emergency Command Structure (IECS)*, which established the chain of command for emergency incidents,

provided that "The highest ranking officer on the scene of an incident is in command until relieved of command by a higher ranking officer" (p. 4). The next section stated, however:

> If two officers of equal rank are on the scene, the first arriving officer is the Incident Commander; however, the officer from the Corporation (LFRD) having jurisdiction over the emergency incident may assume control after notifying the commanding officer (p. 4).

To explain further, if a career (DFRS) Assistant Chief has been on the scene of an incident in the Kensington Volunteer Fire Department's (KVFD) first due area and operating as the incident commander, an Assistant Chief from KVFD can assume command.

A third FRC policy and procedure, *Command Officer Professional Development and Improvement* (COPDI), mandates that command level officers obtain twelve (12) hours of continuing education during each calendar year. This continuing education can be obtained either in county, through classes sponsored by the County's Fire and Rescue Training Academy, or through courses sponsored by agencies outside of the MCFRS. Six of the twelve hours must be obtained "in county". Failure to obtain the mandated number of hours of training will result in the officer not being certified as a command-level officer for the following calendar year until the twelve hours are obtained. Rubin espoused the need for training when he stated "One key component is the training, education and experience needed to

handle a general staff position" (p. 33). Davis, however, writing in his Applied Research Project, believed that the training focus may be off-centered, stating "Unfortunately, in the zeal to design and implement the ICS, the trainers lost sight of the common goal, fire suppression" (November, 1989, p. 2).

PROCEDURES

The County's F.I.R.E.S. reporting system and the Computer Aided Dispatch system were used to produce incident data to answer the following questions:

1. How many incidents were there in which command-level officers were dispatched?
2. What is the average number of command-level officers responding on those incidents?

The primary instrument used to develop most of the data that will be presented was a survey of 96 individuals, sixty-four volunteers and 32 career, certified as command-level officer according to the February 18, 1999 ICES - Certified List of Officers. In Montgomery County a command-level officer is Duty/District Chief (equivalent to Battalion Chief in most jurisdictions) and above. Of the 96 surveys sent out, 42, or 43.8%, were returned. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain:

1. Years of Fire Service Experience;
2. Years as a command-level officer;

3. Experience as a incident commander or other command-level function;
4. Experience with the Emergency Operations Center;
5. Training received over and above the minimum requirements; and
6. Comments and/or suggestions regarding the ICS or IECS.

Assumptions and Limitations

The information on command officers dispatched includes incidents where a command-level officer responded, but the incident, at time of dispatch, did not require a command-level officer. The survey was sent only to those individuals presently on the IECS - Certified List of Officers. The survey was not sent to those who were previously on the list, such as a volunteer who was a command-level officer but was not re-elected or re-appointed. Additionally, this very narrow study was conducted to ascertain the experience and training level of only those within the MCFRS. As such, no comparisons were made to other systems.

RESULTS

In searching the incident reporting system used in Montgomery County, it was difficult to separate the responses of command-level officers into those where they were dispatched and those where they responded on incidents where a command-level officer was not necessarily needed. The research found that in CY98, out of the 82,493 incidents that were dispatched, 3,817 incidents, or 4.6% of the total incidents dispatched, had at least one command level officer dispatched. Of those 3,817

incidents, a total of 6,715 command-level officers were dispatched for an average of 1.76 command-level officers per incident.

Table A shows the total responses for command level officers for CY97 and CY98.

Table A

Number of Command Level Officer Responses

Rank	CY97	CY98
LFRD Chief	3742	3048
DFRS District Chief	1743	1686
LFRD Duty Chief	315	295
Other	1198	1286
Total	6998	6315

As previously mentioned, the survey was distributed to 96 officers at the rank of Duty/District Chief and above. Thirty-two went to DFRS officers and sixty-four went to LFRD officers. Twenty-three, or 71.9%, of the DFRS officers responded, and only nineteen, or 29.7%, of the LFRD officers responded to the survey. Of the forty-two

responses received, 54.8% were received from DFRS officers and 45.2% were received from LFRD officers. Discussion of the results of the survey will be broken down into subject areas.

Fire Service and Command Experience

The first two questions in the survey asked for the individuals total years of fire-service experience and total years of experience as a command-level officer. The overall average of the respondents was 27.3 years of fire-service experience and 10 years of experience as a command-level officer. Table B provides a breakdown of the information received from these two questions.

Table B

Years of Fire-Service Experience and Command-Level Officer Experience

	Total Years of Experience	Average Years of Experience	Total Years of Command Experience	Average Yrs. of Command Experience
Career	669	29.1	227	9.9
Volunteer	478	25.2	194	10.2
Total/Overall	1147	27.3	421	10

Participation as a Command Officer on an Incident

The next three questions on the survey asked if the individual had functioned as the incident commander, a sector officer, or one of the functions such as Planning, Financial or Logistics Officers. Only one, or 2.4%, of the respondents had not functioned as an Incident Commander, and only three, or 7.1%, had not functioned as a sector officer such as Operations, Safety or Staging. Conversely, 26, or 61.9%, of the respondents had not functioned in a role, such as a Recon, Logistics, or Planning Officer, on an expanded Incident Command scenario.

Participation on Incidents Where the EOC was Activated

The next two questions asked if the respondents had participated in an incident where the EOC had been activated and, if so, did the respondent communicate with the EOC as part of that participation. Twenty-four, or 57.1%, of the forty-two respondents indicated that they had participated on an actual incident, exercise or both, where the EOC had been activated. Sixteen were career and eight were volunteer members. Ten of the twenty-four had participated on actual incidents, six on exercises and eight on both actual incidents and exercises. Of the twenty-four respondents, fifteen had communicated with the EOC as part of their participation on the incident or exercise. Table C provides a breakdown of this data between career and volunteer participation.

Table C

Participation on Incident and Communication with EOC

	Actual Incidents	Exercises	Both	Total	Contact with EOC
Career	5	3	8	16	12
Volunteer	5	3	0	8	3
% of total responses	23.8%	14.3%	19%	57.1%	35.7%

The next two questions dealt with training. Specifically, they asked the respondents if they had obtained any additional training in Incident Command or EOC operations and when the last related training was received. Four of the respondents answered that they had attended COPDI courses. Three of the respondents indicated they had not obtained any training other than what was required for the rank they held. Three others did not answer this question.

For the time period in which the last related training had been obtained, one respondent had not received related training for nine years, while another had

training during the last month. The average length of time based on the respondents' answers was 1.6 years since related training had been received.

Suggestions and/or Comments

The last question on the survey asked for comments or suggestions regarding the MCFRS ICS, IECS or EOC operations. Surprisingly, 42.9% (18 of 42) either had no comments or suggestions, or did not answer this question. The most frequent suggestion or comment came from eleven, or 26.2%, of the respondents who mentioned the need for more mandatory training in ICS annually. The second most frequent suggestion or comment concerned the need to provide that career command-level officers would be in charge of incidents or that career District Chiefs would be equal in rank on the incident scene to volunteer Assistant and Deputy Chiefs. Five of the respondents made these suggestions and, not surprisingly, four of the five were career officers.

Two other comments that are worthy of note involved communication and control. One of the respondents noted that communication in reverse needed to be improved. Another suggested that the EOC needs a better understanding that they are a resource and not the incident commander.

In summarizing the results, based on the incident reporting system's data, on average, only 1.76 command-level officers are dispatched per incident in Montgomery County. The average overall experience level, in years of service, of

MCFRS command-level officers is 27.3 years and the average number of years as a command-level officer is ten years. While the majority had functioned as both the incident commander and another sector officer, such as Safety, 61.9 % had not functioned in a command role, such as Logistics or Planning Officer, on an expanded incident. Two times as many career officers than volunteer officers had participated on incidents where the EOC was activated, while four times as many career than volunteer officers were in communication with the EOC on those incidents. More training in ICS and EOC operations was the most frequently offered suggestion or comment.

DISCUSSION

To begin with, the data provided by the incident reporting system showed that, with an average of only 1.76 command officers being dispatched per incident, it is clear that an effective incident command system cannot be accomplished. Assuming, in reality, that at least two command-level officers are dispatched, this still only provides for an incident commander and one sector officer. This is woefully inadequate, but as stated in the Assumptions/Limitations sub-section of the Procedure section, this data captured the number of command officers dispatched, not the number that actually responded. If an effective incident command system is what is desired, as stated by Bruno (November, 1989) and in the FRC Executive Regulation, *Incident Command System* (p. 2), then the proper resources should be

dispatched initially.

The survey revealed that, at least in years of total service and years as a command officer, the current certified command-level officers in Montgomery County are very experienced, with 27.3 years and 10 years, respectively. Additionally, the survey revealed that only one of the respondents had not functioned as an incident commander and only 3 had not functioned in a support function. What the survey did not accomplish, and was not intended to, was a determination of the level of competence the respondents held in the role of a command officer. Obviously, years of experience cannot equate to competence. To further determine the competency level of the certified command officers, some form of evaluation process, possibly involving a wide range of incident simulations, would be necessary.

It is not surprising that over 60% of the respondents had not functioned in a role, such as Logistics Officer, on an incident as these functions are not normally assigned on the typical incident in Montgomery County. It is also not surprising that twice as many of the career respondents compared to the volunteer respondents had participated on incidents, especially on exercises, where the EOC had been activated. While Emergency Management conducts at least four exercises each year, they are held during the day on weekdays. Since the volunteers in Montgomery County tend not to work close to their respective stations and are unlikely to have employers who would let them respond during business hours, like in the old days, the volunteer officers are not afforded the same opportunities to participate in these

exercises.

In Montgomery County, with a combination system and an integrated command structure, it is certain that any incident that may require the activation of the EOC will involve volunteer officers in a command role and most likely as incident commander. Based on the lack of experience, as demonstrated above, it is clear that more exercises, utilizing the full implementation of the incident command system, in conjunction with the EOC, should be conducted during the week, at night and on weekends, and should be made mandatory.

The survey next asked if the respondents had participated in training involving incident command or EOC operation in addition to what was required for the position they currently held. Four of the respondents indicated that the training they attended was COPDI. Because this training is required to be certified as a command officer, it should not be considered additional. These four, combined with the six who either did not answer the question or have not received additional training, account for 23.8% of the respondents. Rubin (June, 1997) referred to training and education as a "key component". Davis (November, 1989), while believing training was being misdirected, saw training as important.

It is not clear, based on the responses to the survey, if the training that was obtained by the remaining 76.2 % truly relates to ICS or EOC operations. In addition, it is not clear if this training had any positive impact on the respondents' ability to command or operate at an incident. To fully determine this, again, some form of

evaluation process would be necessary.

The second question regarding training asked when the last additional training was received. The average was 1.6 years. Since COPDI offerings do not necessarily include reviews of ICS or EOC operations, it would seem logical that these types of reviews be made mandatory as part of the annual certification.

Finally, the last question on the survey asked for comments or suggestions. While 26.9% commented on the need for mandatory training in ICS, it was very disappointing to find that 42.9% either offered no suggestions or did not answer the question. Obviously, the system is not perfect. With some of the data that has been presented earlier, which was obtained from the respondents, it is clear that there is a lack of experience in functioning outside of the typical incident and participating with EOC operations.

As noted earlier, the second most frequently offered suggestion was the need for career command officers either to be in charge, regardless of rank, or that career District Chiefs be equal in rank to Assistant and Deputy Chiefs on the scene of incidents. This suggestion derives from two beliefs. One is the position that the majority of personnel on any incident scene are career and that the career command officer has the obligation to ensure the safety of the career personnel. The other is the belief that career officers are more competent than their volunteer counterparts and, as such, should be in control.

There are also the bad feelings that fester when a volunteer officer takes

command from a career officer. This coincides with what Podlubny (1992) was referring to. While it does not appear to be beneficial for volunteer officers to assume command from a career officer just because they can, current FRC Regulations allow for it to occur. There is no clear indication, however, that any one command officer, let alone a career over volunteer, is better than another. If an extensive study were to be conducted and it found credible evidence that a career officer should be in charge, then proposals to change the regulations would be necessary.

Two things are clear from this study: the current command-level officers are not experienced in expanded ICS roles and EOC operations; and more training is necessary in these areas. To be competent as command officers and to be able to manage incidents effectively are the points espoused not only by Bruno (1989), Coleman (March, 1997) and Flannery (April, 1996), but also by the County's own regulation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study is able to answer the basic research questions presented in the Introduction. It is apparent that there is a need for an evaluation to determine the competence of the command-level officers. It is also quite evident that there is a need to provide annual reviews of the incident command system and EOC operations and to mandate these reviews as additions to the required COPDI classes. In order to accomplish this, the following suggestions are offered as

recommendations:

1. Commission a work group made up of representatives of DFRS, the LFRDs, the Montgomery County Career Officers' Association, the Montgomery County Career Fire Fighter Association and the County Office of Human Resources. This group will be charged with the responsibility of:

A. Developing an evaluation process that would be suitable to determine the competency of certified command-level officers.

B. Developing a curriculum that will be the basis for annual, mandatory training in ICS and EOC operations.

C. Drafting a proposal to include a target date for completion of all work necessary to implement the evaluation process and mandatory training.

D. Determining what monies will be necessary to conduct the evaluation process. Preparing a supplemental budget request to cover these expenditures.

E. Submitting the proposal to the Fire Administrator for review.

Once the Fire Administrator has reviewed the proposal, he should then forward the proposal to the Fire and Rescue Commission for action and if passed, implementation.

If the above recommendations are embraced and ultimately come to fruition, the process that follows should include:

1. Determining if, in fact, career command-level officers' competency rates higher than their volunteer counterparts.

2. If so, the Fire and Rescue Commission should consider changes to the Integrated Emergency Command Structure either to provide that career officers are in charge of incidents, regardless of rank; or to make career District Chiefs' authority equal to that of Assistant Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs on the incident scene.

3. Annually review the curriculum for the mandatory incident command and EOC operations training and make modifications as necessary.

REFERENCE LIST

Bruno, H. (1989, November). Incident command - which system should be the national standard? *Firehouse*, p. 8

Coleman, J. F. (1997, March). To-do lists enhance incident management. *Fire Engineering*, pp. 111-112

Davis, R. D. (1989). *The incident command system: have we given up fire suppression for fire ground management?* (Applied Research Project) National Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, Maryland, Executive Fire Officer Program.

Executive analysis of fire service operations in emergency management (1998). Emmitsburg, Maryland:United States Fire Administration:National Fire Academy

Flannery, T. J. (1996, April). Using the incident command system for training. *Fire Engineering*, pp.24-27

Meyer, S. (1989, June). Incident command logic. *Fire Chief*, pp. 41-46

Montgomery County, Maryland, Fire and Rescue Commission Regulation #58-59, *Incident command system*. (1990)

Montgomery County, Maryland, Fire and Rescue Commission Regulation #52-93, *Integrated emergency command structure (IECS)*. (1993)

Montgomery County, Maryland, Fire and Rescue Commission Policy and

Procedure, *Command officer professional development and improvement*. (1994)

Podlubny, T. J. (1992). *Incident command system, the imperfect process*. (Applied Research Project) National Fire Academy, Emmitsburg, Maryland, Executive Fire Officer Program.

Rubin, D. L. (1997, June). Roles and responsibilities of general staff officers. *Firehouse*, pp. 30-33

APPENDIX

INCIDENT COMMAND SYSTEM SURVEY

How many years of fire service experience do you have? _____.

How many years have you functioned as a command officer (District/Duty Chief or higher)? _____.

What is your current rank? _____.

Have you functioned as the Incident Commander (Level I or II) on an incident? Yes_____ No_____. If yes, what type of incident(s)?

House fire ____ Box ____
Multi-alarm____ EMS____
Other (please explain)
_____

Have you functioned in any other capacity as a sector officer? Yes _____ No_____. If yes, in what capacity?

A Specific Sector ____Safety ____Staging ____Operations_____
Other (please explain)_____

Have you functioned in the ICS as anything other than the functions associated with our typical incidents, such as those listed below? Yes ____ No ____

Planning Officer ____ Recon Officer ____ Logistics Officer____
Finance Officer ____ PIO ____ Liaison Officer ____ OPS Officer ____

Have you ever participated in an incident where/when the EOC was activated? Yes ____ No____. Actual incident _____ or EMG exercise_____.
If yes, in what capacity?
_____

Did your participation involve you being in direct communication with the EOC? Yes _____ No _____. If yes, please explain.
_____
_____

APPENDIX

Other than the course requirements for the rank that you now hold, what training have you had in Incident Command or in EOC operations?

_____

When was the last training in ICS that you received? _____

What comments/suggestions/changes would you make reference the MCFRS ICS, IECS or EOC operations? _____
_____
_____

OPTIONAL INFORMATION
NAME: _____
AFFILIATION: _____
CAREER: _____ VOLUNTEER _____
PLEASE PROVIDE ME WITH THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY. _____